



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/988,246 12/01/97 RADUX

S AM1771-4-T19

EXAMINER

IM62/0606

WILLIAM L SHAFFER
PATENT COUNSEL MS/2061
LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPT. P O BOX 450A
APPLIED MATERIALS INC
SANTA CLARA CA 95052

ZERVIGON, R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1763

DATE MAILED:

06/06/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/988,246

Applicant(s)

Sebastien et al

Examiner

Rudy Zervigon

Group Art Unit

1763



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rudy Zervigon

(3) _____

(2) Chun-Pok Leung

(4) _____

Date of Interview May 30, 2000Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to applicant applicant's representative).Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.Claim(s) discussed: 11, 16, 20, and 22

Identification of prior art discussed:

Patrick et al (U.S.Pat. 5,474,648)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Chun-Pok Leung raised the issue of claims 16 and 20 being objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim (paper 10) and that these same claims were then rejected in the following action. Mr. Chun-Pok Leung also mentioned canceling claims 17 and 18 and adding the claim 22 limitations into claim 11 under a 116 amendment.

I told Mr. Chun-Pok Leung that I would reserve the decision on the claims when the 116 amendment is filed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Marian C. Knobe
MARIAN C. KNOBE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.